



1975

## Evidence for raising in Koine Greek

Stephen A. Marlett  
*SIL-UND*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers>

---

### Recommended Citation

Marlett, Stephen A. (1975) "Evidence for raising in Koine Greek," *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*: Vol. 19 , Article 5.

DOI: 10.31356/silwp.vol19.05

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/sil-work-papers/vol19/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [zeinebyousif@library.und.edu](mailto:zeinebyousif@library.und.edu).

# EVIDENCE FOR RAISING IN KOINE GREEK

Stephen A. Marlett

1. Introduction
2. English
  - 2.1 Paraphrase Relationships
  - 2.2 Case
  - 2.3 Reflexivization Constraints
  - 2.4 Passivization Constraints
  - 2.5 Infinitives
3. Greek
  - 3.1 Paraphrase Relationship
  - 3.2 Case
  - 3.3 Reflexivization Constraints
  - 3.4 Passivization Constraints
  - 3.5 Infinitives
4. Other Facts
  - 4.1 Optional Application of RAISING
  - 4.2 Verbs With Which RAISING Occurs
5. Conclusion

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Modern linguistic theory has much to offer that will contribute to the understanding of language. It is my desire that by demonstrating the application of a current linguistic approach to a phenomenon in Koine Greek, this paper may inspire more general interest in a fresh approach to the study of certain aspects of Greek which I think will yield a better comprehension of the meaning and structure of the valuable texts we possess.<sup>1</sup>

First, I would like to give some background of the theory that I will be working in and illustrate some of its claims.<sup>2</sup> It has been suggested that every sentence in a given language is the surface representation of an underlying conceptual structure. Some have called this underlying structure the semantic structure since it represents the meaning that the speaker wishes to convey. Certain grammarians, recognizing the fact that ideas and objects are not haphazardly related, have called these underlying structures logical structures. A surface structure is derived from a logical structure (LS) by undergoing a series of changes. These changes are described by what we call rules. The LS is operated on by these rules that are applied sequentially, each rule changing the output of the previous rule. These rules that change LS's do so without altering their meaning. The purpose of syntactic rules is to change a logical but abstract relation of meaning into a grammatically correct sentence.

Research in generative grammar has uncovered two types of rules. Some have been found to operate in numerous totally unrelated languages and so they have been called universal rules.<sup>3</sup> Others are limited to individual languages or language families and supply the more superficial aspects of word and sentence form of that particular language. These are called language-specific rules.

In Section 2 of this paper I will illustrate how this theory can be helpful in explaining English sentences. Having done that, I will then argue the same for Koine Greek.

## 2. ENGLISH

### 2.1 Paraphrase Relationships

Many times, we can express the same meaning in English by more than one sentence. Though they may have the same logical structure, they do not have the same surface structure. Compare the following sentences:

- (1) I believe that my mother is honest.
- (2) (a) I believe she is honest.  
(b) I believe her to be honest.

Given the information contained in (1), most English speakers would say that (2a) and (2b) are paraphrases of the same idea and could be used interchangeably in any situation. It seems that there is a need to explain how sentences like (2a) and (2b) can represent the same LS and yet be different in form. Generative grammarians have suggested that by using two universal rules and two language-specific rules, both (2a) and (2b) can be derived from the same LS. One rule is SUBJECT RAISING (abbreviated RAISING) which takes the subject of an object-embedded clause and makes it the object of the matrix clause. This can be illustrated by the following:

- (3) (a) (LS for both (2a) and (2b)) I BELIEVE [SHE BE honest].<sup>4</sup>  
(b) RAISING → I BELIEVE SHE [BE honest].

The reader will notice that RAISING in itself does not render a grammatically correct sentence in English. Another universal rule, INFINITIVIZATION, is necessary to take the verb BE and change it into the infinitive TO BE. (The motivation for this rule will be discussed in Section 2.5.)

- (4) INFINITIVIZATION → I BELIEVE SHE [to be honest].

CASE ASSIGNMENT is one of the two language-specific rules that will further alter this sentence. CASE ASSIGNMENT has a noticeable effect. In English, a pronoun assumes different forms depending on whether it is subject or object of the verb. Since SHE has been raised to become the object of BELIEVE, it will have to be put in the case used for objects.

(5) CASE ASSIGNMENT → I BELIEVE her [to be honest].

VERB AGREEMENT is the last rule that we need to apply in our derivation in order to yield our goal (2b). It will make the verb BELIEVE agree with its subject.

(2b) VERB AGREEMENT → I believe her to be honest.

RAISING is an optional rule in English because we do not have to apply it to derive a grammatical English sentence. If we do not, we can start with the same LS (3a) and, by use of the rules CASE ASSIGNMENT and VERB AGREEMENT make the necessary changes to render our goal, sentence (2a). The verbs BELIEVE and BE will be made to agree with their subjects.

(6) CASE ASSIGNMENT → I BELIEVE [she BE honest].

(7) VERB AGREEMENT → I believe she is honest.

RAISING is a rule that is necessary to explain how sentences like (2a) and (2b) can both represent the same meanings. Paraphrase relationships like this one are one piece of evidence that argues for the existence of RAISING in English.

## 2.2 Case

A RAISING analysis makes the claim that the RAISED noun is the object of the embedded verb. One test that we may make to decide if a noun is really the syntactic object of a verb is to see what case it is in. In the derivation of (2b), RAISING is purported to have applied, and we notice that the result after CASE ASSIGNMENT is that SHE became her. If RAISING had not been applied and SHE has not become an object, we could not explain this occurrence of the form used for objects.

## 2.3 Reflexivization

There is another test (of many that can be demonstrated) to show that the raised subject becomes the true object of the higher verb. There is a universal rule that says that if there is a pronominal object that is coreferential to the subject and they are both in the same clause, the object will be reflexivized. We call the rule REFLEXIVIZATION. In English, this is done by adding -self to the pronoun. Compare the following sentences. (Asterisks are used in this paper to indicate that a sentence is ungrammatical.)

(8) \*I never fool me.

(9) I never fool myself.

(10) I never fool him.

(11) \*I never fool himself.

In sentence (8), I is coreferential to me, so me has to be reflexivized. To not do so would render an ungrammatical sentence. (9) shows that the application of REFLEXIVIZATION renders a correct sentence. Sentence (11) is ungrammatical because REFLEXIVIZATION was applied when the conditions did not exist for it to apply.

Sentences (8) - (11) show that REFLEXIVIZATION is a rule that is part of English grammar. Now consider the following sentence:

(12) I believe myself to be a liar.

We could represent the LS of (12) by (13):

(13) I BELIEVE [I BE a liar].

The reader will notice that the conditions do not exist for REFLEXIVIZATION to apply to (13). They do exist for RAISING however, which would yield (14):

(14) RAISING → I BELIEVE I [BE a liar].

Once RAISING has applied, CASE ASSIGNMENT will give us (15):

(15) CASE ASSIGNMENT → I BELIEVE me [BE a liar].

Once these rules have been applied, the conditions have been met for REFLEXIVIZATION and INFINITIVIZATION. We can illustrate the steps as follows:

- (16) (a) REFLEXIVIZATION → I BELIEVE myself [BE a liar].
- (b) INFINITIVIZATION → I BELIEVE myself [to be a liar].
- (c) VERB AGREEMENT → I believe myself to be a liar.

We have said that REFLEXIVIZATION requires that the coreferential subject and pronominal object be in the same clause. The following sentences show that this is a necessary condition.

- (17a) John<sub>i</sub> can't imagine that his<sub>i</sub> mother would ever kick him<sub>i</sub>.<sup>5</sup>
- (17b) \*John<sub>i</sub> can't imagine that his<sub>i</sub> mother would ever kick himself<sub>i</sub>.

Even though himself is coreferential to the subject of the verb imagine, (17b) is an ungrammatical sentence; this is because the condition that the coreferential subject be in the same clause was not met. REFLEXIVIZATION cannot be applied to (17a). This condition provides us with evidence for an argument that RAISING is a rule operating in English because RAISING alters sentences such as (13) with the result that they meet the conditions for REFLEXIVIZATION. Thus, the fact that we find a reflexive in (12) when superficially the conditions have not been met is evidence for a rule like RAISING.

## 2.4 Passivization Constraints

Another test to show that the putatively raised subject has become the object of the verb of the matrix clause involves the passivization of sentences. The universal rule PASSIVIZATION makes the object of a verb become its subject and it also places the former subject into a new relationship to that verb, with an appropriate alteration in the form of the verb. In English, a prepositional phrase using by is used to indicate the former subject. Therefore, a necessary condition for PASSIVIZATION

is that the verb have an object. PASSIVIZATION could not be applied to a sentence such as (18) because there is no object; run is an intransitive verb.

(18) Bill ran upstairs.

In (19), however, the conditions have been met for PASSIVIZATION since believes has an object. In this case, it has a sentential object.

(19) My mother believes that I am a liar.

(20) PASSIVIZATION → That I am a liar is believed by my mother.

There is another way in which we can derive a passive sentence from (19). This is by applying RAISING first to the LS (21), making I the object of BELIEVE. Because BELIEVE still has an object, PASSIVIZATION can take place. Other rules will finish the derivation.

(21) (LS for (19)) My mother BELIEVE [I BE a liar].

(22) RAISING → My mother BELIEVE I [BE a liar].

(23) INFINITIVIZATION → My mother BELIEVE I [to be a liar].

(24) PASSIVIZATION → I BE-BELIEVED by my mother to be a liar.

(25) CASE ASSIGNMENT → I BE-BELIEVED by my mother to be a liar.

(26) VERB AGREEMENT → I am believed by my mother to be a liar.

It will be noticed that in order to derive sentence (26), with I as the subject of am believed, RAISING had to take place before PASSIVIZATION.

## 2.5 Infinitives

It is interesting to notice that RAISING triggers INFINITIVIZATION whenever it is applied. In English, as well as many languages, when the subject of certain kinds of embedded clauses is deleted or moved out of that clause, the verb of which it was the subject will become an infinitive. Although RAISING is not the only rule that can remove subjects from clauses, it does trigger the same rule INFINITIVIZATION that is triggered by the other rules that remove subjects. One such rule called EQUI-NP DELETION deletes the subject noun phrase out of an embedded clause if it is coreferential to a noun phrase in the matrix clause. Compare the following sentences:

(27) \*I told him that he leave.

(28) I told him to leave.

The he in the complement of (27) triggers EQUI-NP DELETION (abbreviated EQUI). Since EQUI provides conditions for INFINITIVIZATION, the derivation will contain an infinitive as (28) illustrates.

Our rule RAISING, because it removed subjects from embedded clauses by making them objects of the matrix clause, should also cause infinitives to appear in derivations that use it. The fact that in actuality this is what happens serves to lend support to our belief that RAISING is a rule operating in English.

This rather extended discussion has been presented to acquaint the reader with the application of rules such as RAISING to logical structures in order to derive grammatical surface structures. I have also demonstrated some of the tests that can be used to show that RAISING has occurred in a derivation.

### 3. GREEK

#### 3.1 Paraphrase Relationships

I will now demonstrate that in Koine there are structural differences in surface structures having similar LS's that can be explained by the fact that in one derivation RAISING was applied whereas in the other, RAISING was not applied. If these two sentences that we will be deriving had identical rather than just similar LS's, we would be able to use RAISING to explain how one LS could have two surface realizations, just as we did for the English examples in Section 2.1. Consider now the following sentence in Koine:

- (29) thelo: pantas humas lalein glo:ssais  
want-1 all-acc you-acc speak-inf tongues-dat

'I want all of you to speak in tongues.' (I Cor. 14:5)

The LS of (29) could be represented by (30):

- (30) THEL- EM- [LALE- PANT- HUM- GLO:SS-]  
WANT I SPEAK ALL YOU TONGUES

If we want to derive (29) from (30) we will only need to apply a few rules as I will demonstrate.

- (31) (a) RAISING →

THEL- EM- PANT- HUM- [LALE- GLO:SS-]  
WANT I ALL YOU SPEAK TONGUES

- (b) INFINITIVIZATION →

THEL- EM- PANT- HUM- [lalein GLO:SS-]  
WANT I ALL YOU to speak TONGUES

- (c) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

THEL- ego: pantas humas [lalein glo:ssais]  
WANT I all you to speak in tongues

(d) VERB AGREEMENT →

thelo:	ego:	pantas	humas	[lalein	glo:ssais]
want	I	all	you	to speak	in tongues

(e) PRONOUN DELETION → <sup>6</sup>

thelo:		pantas	humas	[lalein	glo:ssais]
want		all	you	to speak	in tongues

Let us now look at another Koine sentence that has THEL- as a verb.

(32) ti            thelete   poie:so:   humin  
       what-acc   want-2   do-subj-1   you-dat

'What do you want me to do for you?' (Matt. 20:32)

Its LS would be (33):

(33) THEL-   HUM-   [POIE-   EM-   T-(?)   HUM-]  
       WANT   YOU   DO   I   WHAT-(?) YOU

It is seen by examining (32) that RAISING has not taken place even though the conditions exist for it to apply in LS (33). Apparently RAISING is an optional rule in Koine. Instead of RAISING applying in the derivation of (32), a couple more language-specific (but not unusual or uncommon) rules will apply that will a) put verbs (with subjects) that are complements of THEL- into the subjunctive mood (with the optional insertion of the complement marker hina) and, b) move the interrogatory pronouns to the front of the sentence. The derivation of (32) would be as follows:

(34) SUBJUNCTIVE INSERTION → <sup>7</sup>

THEL-	HUM-	[POIE-(subj)	EM-	T-(?)	HUM-]
WANT	YOU	may DO	I	WHAT-(?)	YOU

(35) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

THEL	humeis	[POIE-(subj)	ego:	ti	humin]
WANT	you	may DO	I	what-(?)	for you

(36) VERB AGREEMENT →

thelete	humeis	[poie:so:	ego:	ti	humin]
want	you	may do	I	what-(?)	for you

(37) WHAT-FRONTING →

ti	thelete	humeis	[poie:so:	ego:	humin]
what	want	you	may do	I	for you



(39) PRONOUN DELETION →

ti	thelete	[poie:so:	humin]
what	want	may do	for you

Unfortunately, not having resource personnel from whom to elicit and check whatever sentences we would like, we are limited to using the data we can find in our texts. But on the basis of that data, we can find ample evidence to make us believe that RAISING is one valid means to relate Koine sentences that mean the same but are different in their construction.

### 3.2 Case

We are claiming that RAISING makes the subject of an embedded clause the object of the matrix clause. In Greek, the normal case for direct objects is the accusative. If RAISING did enter into the derivation of (29), we would expect that HUM- (YOU) of the LS would receive the accusative case because it has become the object of the verb THEL- (WANT). The fact that this is exactly what we find serves to confirm our hypothesis. Thus, this case is not randomly chosen by Greek grammar to be the case used for the "subject" of the infinitive (as some call it), but it is predicted by our rule RAISING. The analysis using RAISING also explains why these nouns are semantically related to the infinitive but syntactically related to the verb of the matrix clause. Our hypothesis, then, would resolve the argument as to whether this noun in the accusative is actually a subject or object by making it clear that neither view is totally wrong, but that both are inadequate.<sup>8,9</sup>

### 3.3 Reflexivization Constraints<sup>11</sup>

In Section 3.3 we demonstrated how REFLEXIVIZATION can be used to test whether a pronoun is actually an object of a certain clause. Only if it is coreferential to the subject of the same clause can it be reflexivized. This rule also can be used for Greek. Consider the following sentence in Koine:

(39) ego: emauton oupo: logizomai kateile:phenai  
 I-nom myself-acc not yet think-1 attain-perf-inf

'I do not think that I have attained yet.' (Phil. 3:13)

We may posit an LS something like (40):

(40) LOGIZ- EM-(emph) [oupo: KATALAMBAN-(past) EM-]  
 THINK I -(emph) not yet HAVE-ATTAINED I

Notice that the conditions do not exist for REFLEXIVIZATION which is what we must apply in our derivation sometime because of the reflexive form emauton in the surface structure. However, conditions are met in (40) for RAISING which yields (41) when it is applied.

(41) RAISING →

LOGIZ-	EM-(emph)	EM-	[oupo:	KATALAMBAN-(past)]
THINK	I -(emph)	I	not yet	HAVE-ATTAINED

RAISING moved EM- to become the object of LOGIZ-. CASE ASSIGNMENT will therefore put it into the accusative case which is the normal Greek case for direct object. It will also put the subject of the verb in the nominative case.

(42) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

LOGIZ-	ego:-(emph)	me	[oupo:	KATALAMBAN-(past)]
THINK	I -(emph)	me	not yet	HAVE-ATTAINED

The reader will notice that by these two steps, conditions have been met for REFLEXIVIZATION, an obligatory rule in Greek.

(43) REFLEXIVIZATION →

LOGIZ-	ego:-(emph)	emauton	[oupo:	KATALAMBAN-(past)]
THINK	I -(emph)	myself	not yet	HAVE-ATTAINED

To complete this derivation, we will need to apply four more rules. One is INFINITIVIZATION (which will be considered in more detail later in this paper).

(44) INFINITIVIZATION →

LOGIZ-	ego:-(emph)	emauton	[oupo:	kateile:phenai]
THINK	I -(emph)	myself	not yet	to have attained

VERB AGREEMENT will change the verb LOGIZ- to agree with its subject.

(45) VERB AGREEMENT →

logizomai	ego:-(emph)	emauton	[oupo:	kateile:phenai]
think	I -(emph)	myself	not yet	to have attained

We will need a rule to move the subject and object to clause-initial position because emphasis is marked in the LS.

(46) EMPHATIC FRONTING →<sup>10</sup>

ego:-(emph)	emauton	logizomai	[oupo:	kateile:phenai]
I -(emph)	myself	think	not yet	to have attained

The only rule that we lack now is one that will move oupo: from where it is (modifying kateile:phenai) to precede (and modify) logizomai, as it does in (48).<sup>39</sup> A rule similar to this one operates in English also. We call it NEGATIVE RAISING. Here is an example:

- (47) (a) I think that he did not come home last night.  
(b) I don't think he came home last night.

(47a) and (47b) do not differ in their meaning, but they do differ in their construction. NEGATIVE RAISING has moved the negative from the embedded clause into the matrix clause. We cannot deal with this rule definitively in this paper, and it is not pertinent to this study; but we will assume that it operates in Koine in the way we have shown in (46)(39)

### 3.4 Passivization Constraints

We have already discussed in Section 2.3 how interaction with the rule PASSIVIZATION serves as a test for RAISING. If the noun that we claim is an object has been truly made the object of the higher verb, then it should be able to become the subject of that verb when it is passivized. I will demonstrate that this same test also works in Koine. Consider the following sentence:

- (48) akouetai en humin porneia  
hear-pass-3 among you-dat immorality-nom

'It is heard that there is immorality among you...' (I Cor. 5:1)  
'It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you...' (KJV)

The surface structure of sentence (48) could be represented as follows:

- (49) Passive Verb -- Locative Phrase -- Subject

There are two clues that indicate that this sentence must be derived from a logical structure that is more complex than those that exist for most common passive sentences. First, the prepositional phrase among you does not modify the verb hear. It seems necessary to supply a verb such as to be in order to correctly understand the locative phrase. Translators have not hesitated to do this as the quotation from the King James Version indicates. Another reason for a more complex LS is the fact that although syntactically immorality is the subject of the verb is heard, it is obvious that immorality cannot be heard. What is heard is the report (or story) that there is immorality among the group. I suggest the following LS represents the correct meaning of this sentence:

- (50) AKOU- X [en HUM- EI- PORNEI-] <sup>12</sup>  
HEAR X among YOU BE IMMORALITY

There are basically two ways in which this LS could be represented in grammatically correct Greek. One derivation would be as follows:

(51) COMPLEMENT MARKING →

AKOU-	X	hoti	en	HUM-	EI-	PORNEI
HEAR	X	that	among	YOU	BE	IMMORALITY

(52) PASSIVIZATION →

AKOU-(pass)	hoti	en	HUM-	EI-	PORNEI-
BE-HEARD	that	among	YOU	BE	IMMORALITY

(53) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

AKOU-(pass)	hoti	en	humin	EI-	porneia
BE-HEARD	that	among	you	BE	immorality

(54) VERB AGREEMENT →

akouetai	hoti	en	humin	estin	porneia
is heard	that	among	you	is	immorality

But this sentence (54), itself a grammatically correct sentence, cannot be further altered to result in our goal (48). There is an optional rule in Koine that deletes the verb EI-. If this rule were applied to (54), the result would be of questionable grammaticality. But even assuming that the result would be grammatically correct, there is still the problem of an unwanted hoti. Although hoti (that) can be deleted (optionally) if it marks an object complement, it cannot be deleted when it marks a subject complement.<sup>13</sup> We are then left with the dilemma of how to derive (48).

Since the verb in sentence (48) is in the passive voice, we know that we need to apply PASSIVIZATION to the LS sometime in the derivation. Since the application of PASSIVIZATION in (52) did not result in our goal we know that there is something else that needs to happen to make the LS result in (48). The reader will notice that the conditions for RAISING are met. If RAISING were applied, the derivation would be quite different because of the changes made by this rule, as I will show.

(55) RAISING →

AKOU-	X	PORNEI-	[en	HUM-	EI-]
HEAR	X	IMMORALITY	among	YOU	BE

RAISING triggers INFINITIVIZATION.

(56) INFINITIVIZATION →

AKOU-	X	PORNEI-	[einai	en	HUM-]
HEAR	X	IMMORALITY	to be	among	YOU

(The complement marker hoti is not inserted because the complementary clause has been changed, and now AKOU-, (HEAR) had a direct object instead of a complementary clause.) We can now apply PASSIVIZATION.

(57) PASSIVIZATION →

AKOU-(pass)	PORNEI-	[en	HUM-	einai]
BE-HEARD	IMMORALITY	among	YOU	to be

It is important to notice that without RAISING there would be no way in which we could have made PORNEI-, originally the subject of the verb EI- (BE) of the embedded clause, to become the subject of the matrix clause. It had to become the object of the verb AKOU- before PASSIVIZATION could be applied to make it subject.

Further rules will complete our derivation and render the sentence we want.

(58) EI-DELETION → 14

AKOU-(pass)	PORNEI-	[en	HUM-]
BE-HEARD	IMMORALITY	among	YOU

(59) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

AKOU-(pass)	porneia	en	humin
BE-HEARD	immorality	among	you

(60) VERB AGREEMENT →

akouetai	porneia	en	humin
is heard	immorality	among	you

(61) Other Rules of Order →

akouetai	en	humin	porneia
is heard	among	you	immorality

The traditional grammar says that the so-called "subject" of an infinitive is always in the accusative case. Here immorality was the "subject" of the infinitive to be (which could have been left in the sentence because the rule is optional), and yet the case of PORNEI- would still be nominative. This is true because it is functioning as the subject of the verb akouetai. Since the traditional approach cannot adequately explain what is found to be happening in this sentence, I feel that we are obligated to look for a better analysis. A RAISING analysis provides us with the mechanisms that can very explicitly account for the data.

### 3.5 Infinitives

We demonstrated in Section 2.5 how both RAISING and EQUI-NP DELETION trigger INFINITIVIZATION. RAISING provides context for INFINITIVIZATION

by moving the subject of the embedded clause out of that clause, and EQUI-NP DELETION provides context for INFINITIVIZATION by deleting the subject of the embedded clause altogether. In this section, I will show that EQUI-NP DELETION also triggers INFINITIVIZATION in Greek.<sup>15</sup> Since we have established in Sections 3.1 and 3.4 that RAISING is a rule of Koine, we would expect that it also would generate infinitives, just as we have seen that it does. To show how EQUI operates in Koine, I will derive sentence (62).

(62) ei tis thelei pro:tos einai ...  
if anyone-nom want-3 first-nom be-inf

'If anyone wants to be first ...' (Mark 9:35)

The LS would be something like (63):

(63) ei THEL- T-<sub>i</sub> [EI- AUT-<sub>i</sub> PRO:T-]  
if WANT ANYONE<sub>i</sub> BE HE<sub>i</sub> FIRST

We notice that the conditions exist for RAISING or EQUI. We cannot apply both. RAISING would alter the sentence so that EQUI cannot be applied because RAISING has moved the subject from the embedded clause. If EQUI were applied first, it would also remove the subject, thus destroying the conditions necessary for RAISING. However, EQUI is obligatory with the verb THEL-, just as it is with the English verb WANT, whenever the subjects of both clauses are coreferential.

(64) EQUI →

ei THEL- T- [EI- PRO:T-]  
if WANT ANYONE BE FIRST

Since the subject of the embedded clause has been removed, INFINITIVIZATION must be applied.

(65) INFINITIVIZATION →

ei THEL- T- [einai PRO:T-]  
if WANT ANYONE to be FIRST

CASE ASSIGNMENT in this example is a bit more complicated; we cannot discuss its nature in this paper, but the results would be (64). Then other rules will apply and yield our goal (60).

(66) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

ei THEL- tis [einai pro:tos]  
if WANT anyone to be first

(67) VERB AGREEMENT →

ei thelei tis einai pro:tos  
if wants anyone to be first

(68) Other Movement Rules →

ei tis thelei pro:tos einai  
if anyone wants first to be

4. OTHER FACTS

4.1 Optional Application of RAISING

An implication of our discussion of RAISING in Sections 2.1 and 3.1 is that RAISING is not obligatory in either English or Koine. That is, it is not necessary to apply RAISING to any sentence in order to derive grammatically correct sentences. Because it may be applied when its conditions are met, however, we call it an optional rule. If it is an optional rule, we would expect that we could choose to not apply it to LS (30) from above, or that we could apply it to LS (33) and still derive grammatical sentences with the same meaning.

I will not go through the detailed process of deriving these sentences step-by-step, but simply show that the results are perfectly grammatical and identical in meaning to the sentences we have quoted from the New Testament.

(30) THEL- EM- [PANT- HUM- LALE- GLO:SS-]  
WANT I ALL YOU SPEAK TONGUES

(29) RAISING APPLIED →

thelo: pantas humas lalein glo:ssais  
want-1 all-acc you-acc speak-inf tongues-dat (I Cor. 14:5)

(69) RAISING NOT APPLIED →

thelo: lale:se:te pantes humeis glo:ssais  
want-1 speak-subj-2 all-nom you-nom tongues-dat

(33) THEL- HUM- [POIE- T-(?) HUM-]  
WANT YOU DO WHAT-(?) YOU

(31) RAISING NOT APPLIED →

ti thelete poie:so: humin  
what-(?) want-2 do-subj-1 you-dat (Matt. 20:32)

## (70) RAISING APPLIED →

ti	thelete	me	poiein
what-(?)	want-2	me-acc	do-inf

RAISING would thus account for the close relationship between (29) and (69) and between (32) and (70), just as we saw how it explained the paraphrase relationships between (2a) and (2b) of the English examples

### 4.2 Verbs With Which RAISING Occurs

RAISING in both English and Koine cannot be applied with any verb. Listed below are just a few of the verbs with which RAISING occurs in Greek, and references to where it actually has. Of course, there will be many more verbs that will be added to this list.<sup>17</sup>

aiteo:	'ask'	(Luke 23:23)
akouo:	'hear'	(John 12:18)
aphie:mi	'allow'	(John 18:8)
boulomai	'want'	(I Tim. 2:8)
enorkizo:	'adjure'	(I Thess. 5:27)
epithumeo:	'desire'	(Heb. 6:11)
lego:	'say'	(Luke 24:23, Acts 5:36)
logizomai	'think'	(Romans 6:11)
nomizo:	'think'	(Luke 2:44)
parakaleo:	'beseech'	(Acts 27:33, Acts 21:12)
phasko:	'say'	(Acts 25:19)
poieo:	'cause'	(Matt. 5:32)
thelo:	'want'	(I Tim. 2:4)

## 5. CONCLUSION

In this paper I have presented the essence of five pieces of evidence that argue for the necessity of positing a rule RAISING in Koine to explain the surface representation of many logical structures. Simply stated, these reasons are: 1) the need to relate sentences that are paraphrases of each other; 2) the use of the accusative case for the putatively raised subject; 3) the reflexivization of the object claimed to have been derived by RAISING; 4) the unusual construction of certain clauses in which a noun is the syntactic subject of a passive verb to which it has no semantic relationship; and 5) the presence of the infinitive in the complement left without a subject.

I hope that this evidence will stimulate the reader to use this new approach to the study of classical languages. I hope to have shown that it is capable of providing us with tools for explaining otherwise difficult or disputed constructions. Many readers will also probably have already noticed several other interesting processes that occur in Koine syntax just in the limited data given above. Some, perhaps, will have thought of some arguments to use against the position of this paper. I encourage this kind of tension because it is my opinion that the more



pertinent evidence that can be found, the more accurate our analyses will become. Constant testing of hypothesized rules, refining and then either approving or discarding them, is the only way we can improve our analysis of any language.

#### FOOTNOTES:

1. It may seem rather audacious for one who is merely a novice in the study of Koine Greek to be writing a paper such as this. I hope that the reader will not misunderstand my intentions. I would like to express my appreciation to three men in particular--Prof. Buist Fanning (Dallas Theological Seminary) for his excellent help in initiating me in the study of Koine Greek, and Donald Frantz and Richard Rhodes (Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota) for their step-by-step guidance and encouragement in the development of this paper. I also hereby absolve them all of any responsibility for the mistakes that are present. In addition, I wish to thank my friends, whose writing and editorial abilities are far greater than mine.
2. The reader should see the Bibliography for sources of further information on the theory that is the basis of this paper. Especially noteworthy is Postal (1974). He demonstrates the value and implications of RAISING. Although this paper treats RAISING as a straightforward syntactic operation, Postal clearly shows that it involves many extra-syntactic factors. In English, for example, RAISING has constraints on it due to presuppositions implicit in the verb of the matrix clause.
3. Universal here does not mean that all languages show the same version of the rule, but merely that it is a common rule to find among the world's languages.
4. I will be using square brackets ([ ]) to indicate embedded clause boundaries. When the root of a word is written in capital letters, it will be used to represent a meaning, without indicating person, gender, or case. If the voice of a verb is not marked, it is understood to be active. Likewise, verbs not marked for tense are understood to be in the present tense. For example, WANT will represent the verb want, present tense and active voice. In the Greek examples that will follow, the same format will be followed. For instance, HUM- represents YOU (plural). Case is the result of the relations that exist between the noun (or pronoun) and the verb with which it is associated. Unfortunately, the brevity and form of this paper do not permit me to explain in more detail how this works. Basically, we will be working under the assumption that English and Greek are both VSO languages (i.e., they have ordered logical structures that are basically arranged Verb-Subject-Object).

The notation used for the Greek in this paper is purely pragmatic; basically it is a transliteration with the colon indicating that the vowel preceding it is a "long" vowel. Other abbreviations that will be used in this paper are as follows:

1	first person	perf	perfect
2	second person	?	interrogative
3	third person	emph	emphatic
inf	infinitive	nom	nominative
pass	passive	gen	genitive
subj	subjunctive	dat	dative
imper	imperative	acc	accusative
past	some past tense		

The mode of presentation that will be used was chosen so that non-linguists and non-Greek scholars alike may understand the argument. My apologies go to the purists of each group.

5. "i" subscripts will be used in this paper to indicate coreferential nouns and pronouns and adjectives. When necessary, "j" subscript is used to indicate that another referent is involved.
6. Subject pronouns in Koine that are not marked for emphasis are often deleted at a late stage in the derivation. If EI-DELETION (see footnote 14) has removed the verb, the subject pronoun will not be deleted. There are probably other discourse-related reasons to account for the presence or omission of subject pronouns, such as whether the author feels the need to re-establish the connection between the subject of this sentence with some earlier referent.
7. The subjunctive mood is obligatorily used in the complements after verb expressing will, and desire. The reader may consult a Greek grammar for more detail in this matter. The complement marker for these object-embedded clauses that have their verb in the subjunctive is hina. Although in the derivation of (31) it was not inserted, the following sentence shows that it may be.

(i) kai katho:s thelete hina poio:sin humin hoi anthro:poi ...  
and as want-2 that do-subj-3 you-dat the men-nom

'And just as you want men to do to you...' (Luke 6:31)

As long as we are dealing with complements of THEL-, it may be of interest to name another phenomenon. In some languages the subject of the embedded clause does not seem to have been raised by the common rule since it still has effects on the embedded clause. Rather it seems to be the case that the subject is copied into the matrix clause as an object of the main verb and still remains subject of the embedded clause. This rule is called COPY. I will derive (ii) to show how this rule operates. Sentence (ii) is particularly interesting since it has an identical LS to sentence (32) that we have derived above.

(ii) ti thelete me poie:so: humin  
what-acc want-2 me-acc do-subj-1 you-dat

'What do you want me to do for you?' (Mark 10:36)

(iii) (LS for (ii))

THEL- HUM- [POIE- EM- T-(?) HUM-]  
WANT YOU DO I WHAT-(?) YOU

(iv) COPY →

THEL- HUM- EM- [POIE- EM- T-(?) HUM-]  
WANT YOU I DO I WHAT-(?) YOU

(v) SUBJUNCTIVE INSERTION →

THEL- HUM- EM- [POIE-(subj) EM- T-(?) HUM-]  
WANT YOU I may DO I WHAT-(?) YOU

(vi) CASE ASSIGNMENT →

THEL- humeis me [POIE-(subj) ego: ti-(?) humin]  
WANT you me may DO I what-(?) for you

(vii) VERB AGREEMENT →

thelete humeis me [poie:so: ego: ti-(?) humin]  
want you me may do I what-(?) for you

(viii) PRONOUN DELETION →

thelete me [poie:so: ti-(?) humin]  
want me may do what-(?)for you

(ix) WHAT-FRONTING →

ti thelete me poie:so: humin  
what want me may do for you

The reader will notice that if EM- had been moved into the matrix clause as we might have originally suspected, then we would also have expected to find an infinitive instead of the subjunctive form. COPY is a rule that explains this data.

8. See Robertson, p. 489, and Goetchius, p. 197 for two examples of different opinions on this matter of whether it is subject or object. The following quote from Robertson, p. 489, is included solely for the purpose of illustrating the maze to which one alternative explanation eventually leads.

"In these examples, [Luke 24:23, Acts 14:19, I Tim. 2:8], the infinitive is the object of the verb and the affirmation is made as far forth as the word in the accusative. They affirm living as to him; considering having died or death as to him; and wish praying as to the men."

9. It is conceivable that if the verb in the matrix clause took its direct object in another case, the raised object would assume that case also. As yet I have not found any examples to support or counter this notion. Someone might point out Hebrews 6:11 where RAISING has occurred with epithumeo:. This verb uses the genitive case for its object in the New Testament. However Arndt and Gingrich cite numerous references to other early literature in which it is used with the accusative.

It may turn out to be that RAISING cannot take place if the verb of the matrix clause does take its object in a case other than the accusative. Or, the limited number of verbs with which RAISING can occur may preclude the possibility of another case altogether.

10. Word order is an area of Greek grammar to which much more study needs to be devoted. I am not entirely satisfied with the way in which I have accounted for the application of this rule. Perhaps emphasis should be marked otherwise.
11. A related, but more complicated, phenomenon seems to be taking place in the sentence quoted below:

aphes	tous	nekrous	thapsai	tous	heauto:n	nekrous
allow-imp-2	the	dead-acc	bury-inf	the	themselves-gen	dead-acc

'Let the dead bury their own dead.' (Matt. 8:22)

Some of the same constraints that pertain to REFLEXIVIZATION seem to be necessary in deriving reflexive pronouns used as adjectives. If so, this example, once analyzed carefully, perhaps may be used as evidence for RAISING.

12. 'X' will be used in this paper to indicate an unspecified referent. In Greek, an unspecified subject cannot be expressed, and so PASSIVIZATION must apply in the derivation of sentences that have an unspecified subject in their LS.
13. At least I have not found any cases where it may. In John 9:32 and Mark 2:1 } are the only two examples that I have of subject complementary clauses. Both of these have hoti and both are subjects of the verb akouo: in the passive voice.
14. Robertson, pp. 395-396, demonstrates that this EI-DELETION can be applied to almost any form of the verb. It can happen in many varied situations. He cites the clear example of EI-DELETION in Philippians 3:7-8. In one verse, EI-DELETION has applied; in the other, it has not, even though the verb has the same nouns in the subject and predicate nominative positions.

15. I do not mean to imply that all infinitives in Greek are derived by these rules. A great number do, however. Those infinitives that are used with prepositions seem at the present time to require a separate analysis.
16. To illustrate for English compare sentences (i) and (ii):
  - (i) \*I want that I go.
  - (ii) I want to go.
17. The glosses for these verbs have been purposely simplified when it seems that the meaning of the verb with a sentential object is different from its meaning in other usages.
18. Arndt and Gingrich have suggested a similar solution for at least some instances where we claim RAISING has occurred. They state, "Very often the subject of the hoti-clause is drawn into the main clause and becomes the object of the latter." (p. 593).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arndt, William F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 1957. A Greek Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bach, Emmon. 1974. Syntactic Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Blass, Friedrich. 1905. Grammar of New Testament Greek. London: MacMillan.
- Frantz, Donald G. 1975. Generative Semantics. Mimeo (distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club).
- Grinder, John T. 1973. Suzette Hoden Elgin. Guide to Transformational Grammar. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Goetchius, Eugene Van Ness. 1965. The Language of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons.
- Landerman, Peter and Donald Frantz. 1972. Notes on Grammatical Theory. Lima: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1972. Fundamentals of Linguistic Analysis. New York, Harcourt Brace Joranson.
- McCawley, James D. 1974. "On Identifying the Remains of Deceased Clauses". Mimeo (distributed by the Indiana University Linguistics Club).
- Postal, Paul M. 1974. On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and Its Theoretical Implications. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Robertson, A. T. 1919. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. London: Hodder and Stoughton.